



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/062,369	01/31/2002	Stephen S. Breese	AUS920011024US1	2912

87220 7590 04/15/2010
Walder Intellectual Property Law (END)
C/O Walder Intellectual Property Law, P.C.
17330 Preston Road
Suite 100B
Dallas, TX 75252

EXAMINER

POLLACK, MELVIN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2445

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/15/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte STEPHEN S. BREESE, STIG ARNE OLSSON
and GEETHA VIJAYAN

Appeal 2009-008013
Application 10/062,369
Technology Center 2400

Mailed: April 15, 2010

Before DALE M. SHAW, *Division 2 Support Administrator*

ORDER REMANDING APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received at the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on February 24, 2009. A Docketing Notice was mailed and Appeal No. 2009-008013 was assigned on April 17, 2009. A review of the application has revealed that the application was not ready for an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being remanded to the Examiner. The matter requiring attention is identified below.

Claims 30-59 of the instant application contain functional language that may be indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph. *See Ex Parte Rodriquez*, 2009 WL 3756279 (BPAI 2009) and *Aristocrat Techs. Austl. Pty. Ltd. v. It'l. Game Tech.*, 521 F.3d 1328 (Fed Cir. 2008). On September 2, 2008 the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examination Policy, John J. Love, issued a memorandum entitled “Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, when examining means (or step) plus function claim limitations under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph”, located at: http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/section_112_6th_09_02_2008.pdf . Thus, there is a question as to whether claims 30-59 and the claims which depend upon these claims, meet the requirements of being definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is remanded to the Examiner to determine if claims 30-59 and the claims which depend upon these claims, meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

If there are any questions pertaining to this order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

tkl

Walder Intellectual Property Law (END)
C/O Walder Intellectual Property Law, P.C.
17330 Preston Road
Suite 100B
Dallas TX 75252